

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GRACE L. SANDOVAL,

Plaintiff,

vs.

HAROLD SADRI,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 10 CV 171 JM (WVG)

**ORDER DISMISSING
COMPLAINT WITHOUT
PREJUDICE; DENYING MOTION
TO PROCEED IN FORMA
PAUPERIS; DENYING MOTION
FOR APPOINTMENT OF
COUNSEL**

Doc. No. 1

Over the past several years, Plaintiff Grace L. Sandoval has filed in excess of 130 separate actions in this district. (See 08cv1297, 08cv1621, 08cv1622, 08cv1623, 08cv1848, 08cv1849, 08cv1853, 98cv1854, 08cv1868, 08cv1869, 08cv1870, 08cv1944, 08cv2004, 08cv2005, 08cv2057, 08cv2104, 08cv2105, 08cv2151, 09cv0269, 09cv0422, 09cv423, 09cv0424, 09cv0437, 09cv0438, 09cv0441, 09cv0454, 09cv0455, 09cv0456, 09cv0474, 09cv0475, 09cv0476, 09cv0477, 09cv0478, 09cv0491, 09cv0492, 09cv0493, 09cv0494, 09cv0495, 09cv582, 09cv0583, 09cv585, 09cv586, 09cv0588, 09cv0600, 09cv0642, 09cv1232, 09cv1506, 09cv1506, 09cv1507, 09cv1508, 09cv1514, 09cv1515, 09cv1520, 09cv1524, 09cv1526, 09cv1849, 09cv2122, 09cv2141, 09cv2148, 09cv2204, 09cv2205, 09cv2206, 09cv2217, 09cv2218, 09cv2217, 09cv2218, 09cv2244, 09cv2245, 09cv2250, 09cv2251, 09cv2252, 09cv2304, 09cv2305, 09cv2306, 09cv2307, 09cv2308, 09cv2309, 09cv2310, 09cv2311, 09cv2312, 09cv2313, 09cv2450, 09cv2452, 09cv2453, 09cv2462, 09cv2463, 09cv2464,

1 09cv2465, 09cv2466, 09cv2467, 09cv2526, 09cv2528, 09cv2695, 09cv2696, 09cv2765, 09cv2767,
 2 09cv2766, 09cv2768, 09cv2769, 09cv2770, 09cv2771, 09cv2772, 09cv2773, 09cv2875, 09cv2876,
 3 09cv2877, 09cv2878, 09cv2879, 09cv2886, 09cv2889, 09cv2890, 09cv2893, 09cv2894, 09cv2895,
 4 09cv2897, 09cv2898, 09cv2899, 09cv2900, 09cv29002, 09cv2903, 09cv2904, 10cv0068, 10cv0069,
 5 10cv0070, 10cv0071, 10cv0072, 10cv0073, 10cv0111, 10cv0112, 10cv0113, 10cv0114, 10cv0115,
 6 10cv0153, 10cv0154, 10cv0156, 10cv0157, 10cv0168, 10cv0169, 10cv0170, 10cv0171). Each action
 7 was brought *in propria persona* and *in forma pauperis*. Each appears to have been dismissed as
 8 frivolous or for failure to state a claim. The present complaint fairs no better.

9 Without identifying the basis for the court's subject matter jurisdiction, the complaint sets forth
 10 a rambling narrative of charges and conclusions that is mostly unintelligible save some unclear
 11 allegations about Defendant claiming ownership of a taxi that planned to "hit" Plaintiff's car. (Doc.
 12 No. 1, Complaint). As the present complaint, like the scores of previously filed complaints, fails to
 13 identify any basis for federal jurisdiction, or to set forth a coherent statement of her claims, the court
 14 dismisses the complaint at bar as frivolous, for failure to state a claim, and for lack of subject matter
 15 jurisdiction.

16 The Clerk of Court is instructed to dismiss the action without prejudice. Until Plaintiff pays
 17 the filing fee or demonstrates an imminent danger of serious physical injury, the Clerk of Court is
 18 instructed to reject for filing any further document received from Plaintiff in this case. The court also
 19 denies Plaintiff's motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* and for appointment of counsel as moot.

20 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

21 DATED: January 25, 2010



 Hon. Jeffrey T. Miller
 United States District Judge

22 cc: All parties

23

24

25

26

27

28